

University of Northern Iowa UNI ScholarWorks

Faculty Senate Documents

Faculty Senate

11-9-1981

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 9, 1981

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright © 1981 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, November 9, 1981" (1981). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 371.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/371

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

1. Remarks from Vice President and Provost Martin.

CALENDAR

2. 302A Policy on Demonstrations and Picketing on Campus. (See Appendix A--letter to Darrel Davis, Chair, University Faculty Senate from President John Kamerick, dated October 12, 1981.) Docketed because of special circumstances for the next regularly scheduled Senate meeting at which University counsel can be present. Docket 244. (The most significant suggested changes are in part 3 of the policy.)
3. 303 Grade Inflation. (See Appendix B--memo from Thomas Hansmeier, Vice President for Educational and Student Services, October 19, 1981, and letter from C. W. Tittle, Professor of Physics, Southern Methodist University, September 8, 1981.) Docketed in regular order. Docket 245.
4. 304 Report of Academic Master Plan Committee. (See Appendix C--letter and report to President Kamerick and University Faculty Senate from Vice President and Provost Martin, October 5, 1981.) Docketed in regular order. Docket 246.
5. 305 Applications (2) for Emeritus Status. Placed at the head of the docket out of regular order to be considered in executive session. Docket 247.
6. 306 Senate Nominees to ROTC Oversight Committee. Placed at the head of the docket, out of regular order. Docket 248.
7. 307 Request for Authorization to Add One More Student to Student Academic Appeals Board. (See Appendix D--letter from Professor Thomas G. Ryan, Chairperson, Student Academic Appeals Board, October 27, 1981.) Placed at the head of the docket, out of regular order. Docket 249.

DOCKET

8. 306 248 Senate Nominees to ROTC Oversight Committee. Confirmed the nominations of Marlene Strathe, Assistant Professor of Education and Charles T. Strein, Assistant Professor of Economics.
9. 307 249 Request for Authorization to Add One More Student to Student Academic Appeals Board. (See Appendix D--letter from Professor Thomas G. Ryan, Chairperson, Student Academic Appeals Board, October 27, 1981.) Request granted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

10. The Chair informed the Senate that reports would be forthcoming to the Senate from: the Mathematics Competency Committee, the EPC (Report on Academic Ethics), and Vice President Hansmeier (the follow-up to the Residence Hall Educational Environment Report).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

11. The Senate met in executive session to consider two applications for emeritus status. The Senate approved emeritus status for H. Theodore Dohrman, Professor of Sociology and Cecil K. Phillips, Professor of Teaching.

The University Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:17 p.m., November 9, 1981, in the Board Room by Chairperson Davis.

Present: Abel, Baum, Cawelti, Davis, J. Duea, Geadelmann, Glenn, Hallberg, Heller, Hollman, Millar, Noack, Remington, Sandstrom, M. Story, TePaske, Yager (ex-officio)

Alternates: None

Absent: J. Alberts, Richter

Members of the press were requested to identify themselves. Mr. Jeff Moravec, Cedar Falls Record, and Deb Radius, Northern Iowan, were in attendance.

1. Vice President and Provost Martin rose and addressed the Senate. He indicated the Board of Regents will be meeting at UNI on November 18. Dr. Martin stated that the Executive Council of the North Central Association will consider UNI's report at its next meeting in January. Dr. Martin reported that the exchange between St. Cloud State University and the University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire went well and that we will be hosting those two institutions during the month of March. Dr. Martin indicated that in relationship to calendar item #302A, the University would be willing to make University counsel available during the Senate's consideration of this item.

Calendar

2. 302a Policy on Demonstrations and Picketing on Campus. (See Appendix A--letter to Darrel Davis, Chair, University Faculty Senate from President John Kamerick, 10/12/81.)

Remington moved, Geadelmann seconded to docket because of special circumstance for the next regularly scheduled Senate meeting at which University counsel can be present.

Senator Remington stated that he had concerns with items 3a, 3d, and 3e. In 3a he was concerned with the phrase "peace or good order" which he felt was vague. He stated he was concerned with the provisions of 3d because the provisions were too broad and covered violent and non-violent situations equally. In 3e he was concerned with the definition of "university community."

Senator Geadelmann stated that she was concerned with the deletion of the phrase "obscene or libelous" statements from the document.

Vice President and Provost Martin stated that the original document was passed by the Senate in 1968.

Chairperson Davis asked who drafted the current document and if they could be present for the Senate's discussion. Senator Geadelmann responded that judging from the letter it was prepared by the University counsel.

Question on the motion was called. Motion passed. Docket 244.

3. 303 Grade Inflation. (See Appendix B--Memo from Thomas Hansmeier, Vice President for Educational and Student Services, 10/19/81, and letter from C.W. Tittle, Professor of Physics, Southern Methodist University, 9/8/81).

Hallberg moved, Geadelmann seconded to docket in regular order. Motion passed. Docket 245.

4. 304 Report of Academic Master Plan Committee. (See Appendix C--letter in report to President Kamerick and University Faculty Senate from Vice President and Provost Martin, 10/5/81).

Hallberg moved, Geadelmann seconded to docket in regular order. Motion passed. Docket 246.

5. 305 Applications For Emeritus Status.

Cawelti moved, Geadelmann seconded to place at the head of the docket, out of regular order, for consideration in Executive Session. Motion passed. Docket 247.

6. 306 Senate Nominees to ROTC Oversight Committee.

Geadelmann moved, Cawelti seconded to place at the head of the docket, out of regular order. Motion passed. Docket 248.

7. 307 Request for Authorization to Add One More Student to Student Academic Appeals Board. (See Appendix D--letter from Professor Thomas G. Ryan, Chairperson, Student Academic Appeals Board, 10/27/81.)

Hallberg moved, Cawelti seconded to docket in regular order.

Senator Geadelmann questioned postponement of discussion on this matter.

Senator Baum pointed out that the request seeks Senate consideration as soon as possible.

Senators Hallberg and Cawelti withdrew their motion.

Geadelmann moved, Sandstrom seconded to place at the head of the docket, out of regular order. Motion passed. Docket 249.

Docket

8. 306, 248 Senate nominees to ROTC Oversight Committee.

Geadelmann moved, Duea seconded to endorse the nominees as presented.

Senator Remington stated that he had no objections to the people being nominated but inquired if the Senate would appear to be pure in this matter by approving the nominees today without the names having appeared in the Senate minutes. He inquired if perhaps the Senate should delay its vote until a later date.

Chairperson Davis pointed out the names of the nominees did appear in the Senate's agenda which is sent to all faculty.

Vice Chairperson Sandstrom indicated that if the Senate desired more time that was a reasonable option; but he pointed out that if the Senate felt comfortable with the nominees, they should act today.

Question on the motion was called. The motion passed.

9. 307, 249 Request for Authorization to Add One More Student to the Student Academic Appeals Board. (Letter from Professor Thomas G. Ryan, Chairperson, Student Academic Appeals Board, 10/27/81.)

Chairperson Davis pointed out that this request was designed to bring back into balance the ratio between students and faculty on this appeals board. The ratio was changed when a new faculty position was added when the School of Business became autonomous.

Sandstrom moved, Geadelmann seconded to authorize the addition of one more student to the Academic Appeals Board.

Question on the motion was called. Motion passed.

Announcements

10. Chairperson Davis indicated that a report should be forthcoming to the Senate from the Mathematics Competency Committee. Chairperson Davis stated that a report from EPC on academic ethics should be coming to the Senate in the near future and that the report from Vice President Hansmeier on the Residence Hall Educational Environment Committee would be coming to the Senate in December.

Executive Session

11. Geadelmann moved, Duea seconded that the Senate move into Executive Session to discuss docket item 247.

It was moved and seconded to rise from Executive Session.

Noack moved, Hollman seconded to approve emeritus status for H. Theodore Dohrman, Professor of Sociology. Motion passed.

Duea moved, Geadelmann seconded to approve emeritus status for Cecil K. Phillips, Professor of Teaching. Motion passed.

Hollman moved, Geadelmann seconded to adjourn. Motion passed. The Senate adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

These minutes shall stand approved as published unless corrections or protests are filed with the Secretary of the Senate within two weeks of this date, Monday, November 23, 1981.

UNI

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA · Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614

Office of the President
ADSA 310 272-2564

October 12, 1981

Dr. Darrel W. Davis, Chairperson
University Faculty Senate
Department of Accounting
University of Northern Iowa

Dear Darrel:

In April, 1968, the University Faculty Senate approved a policy on demonstrations and picketing on campus. I have enclosed a copy of that policy. Because of the great number of court decisions rendered in the 1970's I asked our university counsel to review the policy to see if portions of it should be changed as a result of changes in the law. He has provided me with his recommendations for changes in our policy which I am also including with this letter.

You will note that there are very few changes recommended, but, nonetheless, it would seem desirable to have the University Faculty Senate review any changes before they are made effective.

Probably the first word in 3.d. should be advocate rather than advocating.

Sincerely,


John J. Kamerick
President

JJK:ftd

Enc.

cc: Members, University Faculty Senate
CabinetDEMONSTRATIONS AND PICKETING ON CAMPUS

1. Historically, petitions, assembly, demonstrations and picketing have been used by a free people to express their belief and to air their grievances. These methods of expressing group opinion are an important part of our heritage and a legitimate means of showing group opinion, provided they are conducted in an orderly manner with due respect for the rights of others. It is the policy of the University to permit such expression of opinion for lawful purposes and not to permit interference with same by those who disagree with the opinions expressed by the demonstrators.
2. The institution has prepared this statement indicating its policy and procedures with respect to demonstrations or picketing. Copies will be kept readily available in the President's Office, Student Services Office, and Security Office for possible distribution in case it is necessary to make the policy known in an emergency situation.
3. The University will permit students and staff to conduct demonstrations, to picket on campus, or to conduct counter-demonstrations and picketing, provided such actions are so conducted that the demonstrators or picketers do not intentionally:
 - a. disrupt, obstruct, or interfere with the operation of the institution;
 - b. interfere with the flow of traffic on streets, highways, sidewalks, or hallways, or through entrances and exits;
 - c. molest, abuse, or interfere with the lawful rights of students, staff, or visitors to the campus, including others who may be engaged in demonstrations;
 - d. use obscene or libelous statements, either orally or in writing, and do not violate civil or criminal law or criminally incite others to do so;
 - e. engage in action that damages or clearly threatens to damage the property of the university or of individuals in the university community.
4. If demonstrators or picketers violate one or more of the above conditions, they shall be reminded of their violation, and those who continue shall be subject to discipline by the University in accordance with established University rules and procedures. Such disciplinary action includes the possibility of immediate temporary suspension, pending action through regular disciplinary procedures which, in turn, might include dismissal from the University.
5. If the violations cannot be handled satisfactorily by the staff of the University, the chief administrator of the University, or his/her designated representative, will request the assistance of the local police and such additional law enforcement officers as may be necessary, to protect persons and property and to enable the University to conduct its business in an orderly way.

(University Faculty Senate, April 15, 1968)

PROPOSED POLICY

DEMONSTRATIONS AND PICKETING ON CAMPUS

1. Historically, petitions, assembly, demonstrations and picketing have been used by a free people to express their belief and to air their grievances. These methods of expressing group opinion are an important part of our heritage and a legitimate means of showing group opinion, provided they are conducted in an orderly manner with due respect for the right of others. It is the policy of the University to permit such expression of opinion for lawful purposes and not to permit interference with same by those who disagree with the opinions expressed by the demonstrators.

2. The institution has prepared this statement indicating its policy and procedures with respect to demonstrations or picketing. Copies will be kept readily available in the President's Office, Student Services Office, and Security Office for possible distribution in case it is necessary to make the policy known in an emergency situation.

3. The University will permit students and staff to conduct demonstrations, to picket on campus, or to conduct counter-demonstrations and picketing, provided such actions are so conducted that the demonstrators or picketers do not intentionally:

- a. disrupt, obstruct, or interfere with the peace or good order or the operation of the institution;
- b. interfere with the flow of traffic on streets, highways, sidewalks, or hallways, or through entrances and exits;
- c. molest or interfere with the lawful rights of students, staff, or visitors to the campus, including others who may be engaged in demonstrations;
- d. advocating the use of force or law violation when such advocacy is directed to inciting or producing lawless action and is likely to incite or produce such action;
- e. engage in action that damages or clearly threatens to damage the property of the university or of individuals in the university community.

4. If demonstrators or picketers violate one or more of the above conditions, they shall be reminded of their violation, and those who continue shall be subject to disciplinary action by the University in accordance with established University disciplinary rules and procedures, which disciplinary action may include suspension or dismissal from the University.

5. If the violations cannot be handled satisfactorily by the staff of the University, the chief administrator of the University, or his/her designated representative, will request the assistance of the local police and such additional law enforcement officers as may be necessary, to protect persons and property and to enable the University to conduct its business in an orderly way.

TO: Darrel Davis

FROM: Tom Hansmeier *TH*

DATE: October 19, 1981

After reading the materials from Southern Methodist University, I am left with the conclusion that our Faculty Senate should appoint an ad hoc Committee on Grade Inflation. The issue is certainly of great importance to the academic enterprise, the issue is complex and multifaceted, and the solution(s) to the problem must come from the faculty. My only concern is that a committee, if appointed, must be given some deadline dates. If not, the issue may be talked to death.

Would like to discuss "next steps" with you.

/nk

September 8, 1981

Professor Darrel M. Davis
Chair, University Faculty Senate
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614

Re: Grade Inflation

Dear Professor Davis:

I am responding to your request for information on our grade inflation study by enclosing a copy of our report dated October 29, 1979, and a one-page updated report of March 4, 1981.

I have added some data to the 1979 report. The graph for SMU in Fig. 1 has been extended to 1980. Both curves in Fig. 2 have been extended to 1980. I have added some 1979 data to Table II. [See the 1981 report for more recent data.] In Table IV I have added the overall grade distribution for 1979. An error in plotting the point for 1968 has been corrected in Fig. 1 but persists in Figs. 3, 4, and 5.

As you can see from Fig. 1, the large inflation we experienced in the mid-1970s has almost been corrected. At the peak we were about 0.3 point above Juola's "national average" but are now only about 0.1 point above. In pre-inflation days we were about 0.05 point above.

The only action our Senate has taken has been:

- (1) To adopt the report, with Item 11, page 15, being the specific recommendation to the faculty.
- (2) To keep a continuing watch on the grade trend and report this to the faculty.

It seems clear that the appearance of the report in 1979 just before the end of the Fall semester had the immediate effect of bringing grade inflation to the attention of the faculty. This is seen in the rather large drop of the GPA between 1978 and 1979 (see 1981 report).

Another avenue of information for the faculty has been a compilation of grade distributions, by department, which has been distributed by the Provost's office each fall beginning in 1979. The large number of A's being given was particularly conspicuous. This helped to heighten faculty awareness of the problem. The first of these reports preceded the issuance of the 1979 Grade Inflation Report by about a month.

There has been no overt administrative action on grade inflation, but the Grade Inflation Report did result from a suggestion made by the Provost to the Faculty Senate that the matter be investigated. Some of the deans have monitored grades but, to the best of my knowledge, they have restricted their actions to conferring with department heads and possibly individual faculty members.

I hope that this summary and the enclosed documents answer your questions. If not, I would be pleased to supply more information if I can do so.

Yours sincerely,

C. W. Tittle
Professor of Physics

ChT:rd
Enclosures



UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA - Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614

Vice President and Provost
AREA 318 373-7617

October 5, 1981

President Kemerick
UNI Faculty Senate

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed is the 1981 report of the Academic Master Plan Committee. We commend this report to you and solicit your support and cooperation in achieving its recommendations.

Sincerely,

James G. Martin
Vice President and Provost

JGM:d

Enclosure

cc: Cabinet
Council of Deans
Department Heads

QUALITY AND QUANTITY IN THE 1980's
at the
University of Northern Iowa

Goals, Priorities and Recommendations

Report of the Academic Master Plan Committee
1981

Preface:

The principal theme of this report of the Academic Master Plan Committee is the subtle, complex and critical relationship between academic quality and the size of the university during the first several years of the 1980's. Although this concern is the paramount thrust of this report, it also mentions some specific issues and objectives which the committee deems to be of surprising importance to the institution.

1. Academic Excellence

The university should assume the risks involved in giving the highest priority to academic excellence because of the long-term benefits to the institution. In balancing the risks and the advantages of this policy the university should maintain its resolve to be accessible to students whose capacity for learning has not been realized or even challenged because of social and economic hardships, including poor educational opportunities in the elementary and secondary schools.

In electing the emphasis on quality we must realize the crucial role of faculty. The university can be no better than its faculty and outstanding students are attracted by distinguished faculty.

In order to plan intelligently for excellence in educational programs it is essential to bear in mind that quality and quantity can be inextricably related in certain respects. To take a rather obvious example, if library holdings are a function of enrollment size, then, everything else being equal, the quality of the institution would suffer with declining enrollment. Similarly, if a larger enrollment would mean a proportionately larger faculty, the educational program would be enriched because of a greater depth and variety of faculty. If course and program offerings to students are constricted as a result of a lower enrollment, then (*ceteris paribus*) quality of education would decline. A crucial question is whether UNI can maintain its budget size with declining enrollment. Will the state increase appropriations to make up for declining tuition income?

The predicted decline of enrollments for the 1980's may be a cloud with a silver lining. The University of Northern Iowa has seen a long period of expansion and increasing enrollments, often with insufficient increases in budgets and faculty to handle this rapid expansion. The 1980's can be a positive period during which the university could consolidate its strengths and increase the quality of its programs. The university should be able to give greater attention to its students and its programs and strive for quality education. Without the necessity of accommodating even greater numbers, faculty should be able to devote more time to research and other scholarly activities. These positive benefits will not, however, come about automatically; proper planning is very important.

We are fortunate at the University of Northern Iowa in that the size of the institution, as measured by student enrollment, mitigates against an impersonal educational environment.

A complicating factor in making decisions about admission and retention of students is the fact that for this metropolitan area the University of Northern Iowa does necessarily perform something of a community college and evening college function. We are extremely fortunate in this community in having an outstanding vocational/technical institution, the Hawkeye Institute of Technology; but, the University of Northern Iowa, in contrast to the other two Regents universities, is located in a metropolitan area without a public or private community or junior college. This is part of our mission which we should continue to perform gladly.

In giving the benefit of the doubt to quality over quantity, where there is a clear choice, the university should be cautious about "predicting demand" for various educational programs. Although we should not spare our students our considered educational judgment about employment prospects for a few years hence, we should also inform them of the fact that such predictions in the past have not been highly accurate. Also, we should protect and respect students' freedom of choice in academic program selections and career decisions.

It is imperative that the University of Northern Iowa continue its pursuit of excellence and its leadership role in the state and nation in the field of education. The institution's splendid reputation for quality in professional education must be preserved. At the undergraduate level this will mean continued adherence to high standards for admission and graduation. It will also mean selectivity at the graduate level, especially for the terminal degree. It is absolutely essential that the university offer the doctorate in education in order to maintain its leadership position in the field and to make its program whole. The importance of the terminal-professional degree will increase and UNI will not be able to provide future educational leaders in public education in Iowa or elsewhere without offering that degree.

2. Doctor of Education Program

The university must aggressively pursue the authorization to offer the doctoral degree in education. The centrality of this program is essential to the institution's vitality. History has conferred a leadership role in professional education on this institution. Its program, now over a hundred years old, will not be complete until the terminal professional degree can be offered. The offering of the doctorate would enrich and invigorate the whole program in education and fulfill the institution's mission to provide educational personnel for the schools, colleges and universities and enable it to remain at the forefront of research and development in the field of education.

3. Concept of "Standby Curricula"

Departments and colleges should be encouraged to explore the development of "standby curricula" which they consider to be worthy of offering but which might not be feasible to offer at the present time because of staffing, budget, or limited demand. These programs might be held in reserve until staffing and budgetary opportunities present

themselves or until the enrollment demand is sufficiently strong to warrant putting them into practice.

4. Enrollment Mix

Should the university make any concerted effort to alter the current mix of students? Should any effort be made to increase or decrease enrollment in the professional programs, arts and sciences, etc., etc.?

A previous Academic Master Plan Committee report (1978-79) encouraged "reasonable enrollment diversity" in terms of geographic and cultural backgrounds.

The present distribution of professional, vocational and arts and sciences enrollment, while it is not ideal to some members of our academic community, is more "balanced" than in the past. We urge the university to guard against a further significant shift in the direction of applied/vocational areas at the expense of the arts and sciences. Also, we urge professional and vocational programs to avoid excessive undergraduate specialization at the expense of electives in the arts and sciences.

5. Student Accessibility/Admission/Quality

The university should pay more attention to making the institution attractive to students with unusual promise and ability. This would mean a more vigorous effort to make UNI attractive to National Merit Scholars as well as students who have extraordinary potential but may not have outstanding high school records.

The Academic Master Plan Committee commends the model of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences; the college and its departments have made a special effort to expose outstanding high school seniors to the programs available in the college by bringing them to campus. We also commend the model of the School of Music which seeks out talented students and encourages them in positive ways. Such efforts have been abetted by the Vice President for Educational and Student Services.

6. Faculty Vitality

In addition to our vigorous and conscientious recruiting efforts, including "going an extra mile" to seek out candidates in fulfilling our affirmative action obligations, the university must also expend more energy and resources in maintaining faculty vitality and encouraging faculty development.

The Academic Master Plan Committee endorses the following measures:

a. Encouragement of Professional Development Leave applications. The most expensive part of faculty professional development resources is usually faculty time, and professional development leaves provide a semester with full pay or a year at half pay. The cost of this amount of time would be equal to a substantial grant from a federal agency or a private foundation for example. We should remind our colleagues that it is not necessary to leave the campus in order to take a PDL. For some faculty this may be necessary for field work, research, or access to archives or specialized laboratories, etc., but for many faculty professional activities, such as research and writing, compensated time is crucial.

b. Joint appointments can enhance faculty vitality, promote interdisciplinary teaching and research, enrich programs in an individual department and eliminate unnecessary duplication of courses. In joint appointments it is necessary to protect the tenure and promotion opportunities for a faculty member by "anchoring" the appointment in a specific department for that purpose. Budgetary arrangements should be facilitated by the college and by Academic Affairs. Joint appointments can also encourage and facilitate collaborative teaching and research, particularly in fields which transcend departmental boundaries.

c. We all need to promote, stimulate and reward grant proposal preparation. The university fares rather poorly in external support for faculty professional activities such as research. It is essential that we reward proposal writing as such because even proposals which are unfunded by external agencies are worthwhile. Typically, the person writing a proposal manages to undertake the project on some kind of reduced scale or from internal resources even though a project is not externally funded. In any event, external funding will not occur without proposal writing. The Graduate College and the Office of Grant Administration can be helpful within limits in this endeavor but faculty members are the ultimate source of proposals. Assessments and evaluations for promotion, tenure and merit salary increases should pay attention to the preparation of proposals because this is both an indicator and a catalyst of faculty development.

d. If there is enrollment decline in the 80's, then faculty should be offered the opportunity to devote more time to other professional activities as the teaching load lessens. The university must argue forcefully for maintaining the same level of staffing with lower enrollment because faculty size has not increased proportionately with enrollment growth. Consequently, research, professional service projects, and faculty development, often had to be neglected because of enrollment pressures.

7. Curricular Requirements and Student Planning Problems

Departments and colleges should investigate the feasibility and advisability of some five-year programs. The General Education Committee should explore, at least in a preliminary way, the desirability of a five-year program as a means of readjusting the balance between general education and vocational specialization. With an additional year it should be possible to require a more rigorous general education program and still allow for substantial specialization in major fields.

Perhaps in some areas of the liberal arts, a five-year program would permit "vocational minors" which would facilitate employment after graduation.

The College of Education might consider offering an optional five-year program which might include an "alternate career minor" for education majors, especially in view of the fact that many people who prepare to teach do not do so. This might also allow some graduates to pursue other employment temporarily during a period of weak demand for teachers in their area of professional training.

The Academic Master Plan Committee commends the concept of a five-year liberal arts/MSA program and similarly a five-year MSA program with an undergraduate major in computer science.

Perhaps one or two experimental five-year programs could be offered as an option to students.

UNI

8. Changing "Student Marketplace"

The institution should be alert to the opportunities and to its responsibilities for changing educational demand. UNI must be prepared to adapt to a changing "student marketplace," bearing in mind the concerns and issues expressed previously in this report about the exquisite relationship between quantity and quality.

To prepare for the changing demographics of the educational marketplace the university should make special efforts to determine the adult education market. As we encourage the concept of lifelong learning, we should determine what courses and programs prospective students want, when they want them, and where they want them offered.

We should also investigate new delivery methods, including the new electronic technology, which may enable us to reach students who cannot conveniently travel to the campus.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Dr. Roger M. Betts, College of Natural Sciences
 Dr. Emil W. Bock, College of Humanities and Fine Arts
 Mr. Bruce P. Conrad, School of Business
 Dr. Steven B. Corbin, School of Business
 Ms. Joan E. Diamond, College of Education
 Dr. James L. Doud, College of Education
 Dr. Len A. Froyen, College of Education
 Dr. Richard A. Hays, Jr., College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
 Mr. James A. Hoolber, College of Education
 Dr. Elaine B. Kaimar, College of Humanities and Fine Arts
 Ms. Aurelia L. Klink, School of Business
 Dr. James C. Macmillan, College of Natural Sciences
 Dr. Donna Maier, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
 Dr. Peter S. Michaelides, College of Humanities and Fine Arts
 Mr. Lee M. Nicholas, School of Business
 Dr. Karl E. Odwarka, College of Humanities and Fine Arts
 Dr. Donald E. Shepardson, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
 Dr. Linda L. Walsh, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
 Dr. James C. Walters, College of Natural Sciences
 Ms. Wanda P. Wehner, College of Natural Sciences
 Mr. J. Chris Gammack, Student
 Ms. Deborah J. Orth, Student
 Vice President and Provost James G. Martin, Chair

September, 1981

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA • Cedar Falls, Iowa 52601

Department of History
 UNI 52601-2000

October 27, 1981

Dr. Darrel W. Davis, Chairperson
 University Faculty Senate
 UNI

Dear Darrel,

At its meeting on October 21, 1981, the Student Academic Appeals Board voted to ask the University Faculty Senate to authorize the appointment of an additional student member of the Board. This would restore the equal number of student and of faculty voting members of the Board which existed before a fifth (fourth voting) member of the faculty was appointed to the Board as part of the separation of the School of Business from the College of Business and Behavioral Sciences. Because the Board may soon have an appeal to hear, it hopes that the Senate will consider this request at the earliest possible date.

Cordially,

Tom

Thomas G. Ryan
 Chairperson, Student Academic Appeals Board

TGR/lj